

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

April 28, 1997 LB 806

certainly that issue. I thought it was an opportunity for us to eliminate that checkerboarding, but I think, as Senator Bromm and others have articulated, it was at too great of an emotional cost to people who had thought that they had gone through that process and did not want to have to vote again. But it still supports what I had always thought, and that is reducing costs. I've given the example many times, but certainly if it was never the intent to just say what we have tried to say with Class I's and looking at that situation, besides having to find a system that divides up the levy, the other is finding something that drives efficiency or cost reduction. We simply cannot afford, in my opinion, to have a per pupil cost of 18,000, or unless it's in a unique situation out in the western part of the state, or 14,000, or 9,000, or 8,000, or 7,000, or 6,000, when we're looking at the majority of students in the state and saying we're going to recognize, except for special ed and transportation, 4,119. That has been the issue for me, with limited dollars, how can we or why should we continue to allow the spending at that cost? I think this gets at that issue, it brings it down. And although it may take two years, it may take three years, but it's going to get it right at the cost of how that high school is operating, the cost of their K-8. That's always been, I think, what my prime concern since I voted for 1114. I think we have an obligation to bring those costs down. I think this amendment meets that. And, like I said, the only thing that I see, that I would have preferred having was an opportunity to eliminate the checkerboarding, and it does not do that. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Senator McKenzie.

SENATOR MCKENZIE: Thank you, Madam President and members. I, too, rise in support of the Bohlke amendment. But I wanted to bring up a couple of circumstances that the committee, or at least a committee of a few talked about in trying to reach some compromise. There are circumstances where Class I districts and those high school, primary high school districts would believe that a higher expenditure was necessary in cases where in fact you did have closed classrooms for option, or where you just did not have any other room to accept children, if you were talking about keeping them open, or closing them, special needs that might exist in a particular class within that Class I. But the